

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.ospto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/812,562	03/21/2001	Tadahiro Uehara	826.1705/JDH	2631	
21171 75	590 11/16/2004		EXAMINER		
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			ZHEN, LI B		
SUITE 700 1201 NEW YO	RK AVENUE, N.W.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTO	· ·		2126	<del> </del>	

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action		Application No.	Applicant(s)	(9)				
		09/812,562	UEHARA ET AL.	<u> </u>				
		Examiner	Art Unit					
		Li B. Zhen	2126					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress				
Therefinal re conditi	EPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APF ore, further action by the applicant is required to a jection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 on for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe- nation (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	<ol> <li>a timely filed amendment wh</li> </ol>	cation. A proper repich places the application	cation in				
	PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) 🔀 b) 🗀		risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	of the final rejection.					
	706.07(f).							
nave bee 37 CFR (b) above	ensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dain filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorteneds, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most atent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in				
	A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF		=					
2.	The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:						
(a)	$\hfill \square$ they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);					
(b)	$\hfill \square$ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by	below);						
(c)	they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or s	simplifying the				
(d)	$\hfill \square$ they present additional claims without cancel	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ms.				
	NOTE:							
3.	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejec	ction(s):						
	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment				
	The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.							
	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.							
7.🖂	For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.							
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
	Claim(s) allowed: none.							
	Claim(s) objected to: none.							
	Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-17</u> .							
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u> .							
8. 🗌	☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.							
9. 🗌 1	Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme							
10.	Other:		MENG-AL T. AN					
		/	MENG-AL T. AN					
		AUDE	RVISORY PATENT EXP CHNOLOGY CENTER	4MINER 2100				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

In response to the Final-Office action mailed on June 7, 2004, applicant argues:

- (1) there is no disclosure or suggestion in McKeehan that there be plural such CacheManagers [p. 7, lines 27 28];
- (2) there is no disclosure or suggestion concerning switching or substituting CacheManagers [p. 7, lines 29 30];
- (3) there is no disclosure or suggestion concerning switching or substituting one PersistentContainer for another [p. 8, lines 1 2]; and
- (4) a method in McKeehan refers to a function associated with a class while a method of the present invention corresponds to a particular component and not several components [p. 8, lines 2 6].

As to argument (1), examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that the prior art suggests that there is a plurality of CacheManagers because McKeehan teaches a plurality of PersistentContainers [e.g., col. 19, lines 1 - 14] and that each PersistentContainer includes a CacheManager [e.g., col. 19, lines 15 - 23].

As to arguments (2) and (3), examiner notes that the framework extension [e.g., col. 18, lines 48 - 67] and subclassing [e.g., col. 19, line 50 - col. 20, line 5] of McKeehan would read on the switching of the present invention because the extension process select specific core classes and extends the from the core classes to define new classes that support a specific persistent storage [e.g., col. 22, lines 1 - 22].

In response to argument (4), examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that the methods in a class of McKeehan perform the data managing method of the present invention [e.g., col. 20, lines 13 - 30]. The method of McKeehan also corresponds to a particular component, the component being an instance of the class that the method belongs to. In addition, McKeehan also describes defining specific steps and their order needed to provide a variety of different persistent storage environments [e.g., col. 18, lines 9 - 20]..